



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,144	06/15/2001	Leroy A. Kuta	56731USA9A (M120.137.101)	8293

7590 10/04/2002

Timothy A. Czaja
Dicke, Billig & Czaja, P.A.
701 Building, Suite 1250
701 Fourth Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55415

EXAMINER

OSELE, MARK A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1734
DATE MAILED: 10/04/2002

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/883,144	KUTA ET AL. <i>b3</i>
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark A Osele	1734

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-20 and 22-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3,4 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4,6,7,8</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 10-12, 18-20, 22-28, 33-37, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormick et al. (5,524,844) in view of Weinberg et al. (5,916,651). McCormick et al. shows a method and apparatus for applying a splicing tape by lifting a portion of the outer-most layer of the roll, applying tension to the layer, cutting the lifted portion at a known location to coincide with a tape application line, applying a splicing tape to the wound portion of the roll at the application line, and adhering the leading edge of the cut outer-most layer to the splicing tape (column 7, lines 1-6, 18-21, 33-35, 43-58). McCormick et al. fails to show the outer-most layer to cover only a portion of the tape while leaving a portion of the tape exposed.

Weinberg et al. teaches that an adhesive tape with a split cover liner should extend approximately one quarter to one third of the way underneath the outer-most layer of the roll, leaving the remainder exposed for splicing to the new web (column 2, lines 4-9, 51-60, column 3, lines 40-45, 61-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the tape of Weinberg et al. in the method and apparatus of McCormick et al. because Weinberg et al. shows

this to be an effective single tape for both adhering the outer-most layer and accomplishing the splicing to a new roll.

Regarding claim 8, Weinberg et al. teaches the tape to be applied at an angle to the machine direction.

Regarding claim 26, although McCormick et al. shows a single spring loaded roller, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a plurality of rollers because a plurality of short rollers have less tendency to warp and bend than a long roller.

Regarding claims 14-15 and 33-37, cutters and sensors are conventional in tape applying devices to ensure that the tape is appropriately placed on the substrate.

3. Claims 9, 13, 16, 29-32 and 38-39, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormick et al. in view of Weinberg et al. as applied to claims 1 and 18 above, and further in view of Koza et al. (5,431,767). Koza et al. teaches that pressure rollers are conventional for applying a strip of adhesive tape and take up liner removers are also known in the art to limit operator effort when applying double sided adhesive tapes to a surface (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the pressing roller and take up reel of Koza into the invention of the references as combined because they are shown to be an effective automation system.

Koza et al. further teaches the use of a perforation line along the length of the tape to aid in a controlled tape separation for the flying splice connection (column 5,

lines 53-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the perforation line of Koza et al. into the invention of the references as combined to allow fast and accurate separation of the outer-most layer from the remainder of the roll to begin the splice.

4. Claims 17 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormick et al. in view of Weinberg et al. as applied to claims 1 and 18 above, and further in view of the admitted prior art. The admitted prior art teaches the use of a sensor to determine the leading edge of the roll before lifting this edge (instant specification, page 9, lines 20-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the sensor of the admitted prior art to ensure that the lifting mechanism operates on the outermost edge of the roll, thereby preventing waste.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3-4 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: None of the prior art suggests lifting the outer-most layer a specified amount for cutting followed by further lifting to apply the tape. In addition, none of the prior art suggests moving the tape cutter and adhesive applicator separately.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fournier et al. and Puyear each show diagonal splicing of webs.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A Osele whose telephone number is 703-308-2063. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Tues, Thurs, 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on 703-308-3853. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



**MARK A. OSELE
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

September 30, 2002